REMARKS

In the official action mailed on **13 May 2008**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-23, and 25-32. Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-23, and 25-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Atkinson et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0012329, hereinafter "Atkinson"), and Chang et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0083121, hereinafter "Chang"). Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-23, and 25-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Chang.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a)

Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 were under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and U.S.C. §103(a) based on Atkinson and Chang.

Applicant respectfully points out that neither Atkinson nor Chang teaches **that a server provider or a service providing device (e.g., an output device) selects a service profile (e.g., a device driver) from multiple service profiles for a client device based on the type information of the client device**.

Applicant respectfully submits that embodiments in Chang are directed to **an information apparatus (i.e., client device) selecting an output device (i.e., a service providing device) from multiple output devices based on attributes of the multiple output devices**. More specifically, Chang discloses that selecting an output device involves "establishing a communication channel between an information apparatus (e.g., client device) and multiple output devices (e.g., service providing devices); receiving at the information apparatus over the communication channel one or more attributes corresponding to the multiple output devices; and selecting at the information apparatus an output device for rendering the data content based on at the one or more attributes" (see Chang, [0139]-[0149] and the Abstract).

In contrast, the instant application teaches that **a service provider (e.g., printer 108) selects a service profile among a set service profiles based on the**

type information of the client device, and sends the selected profile to the client device (e.g., laptop 102) (see paragraphs [0027] and [0037], and FIG. 2 of the instant application).

Applicant respectfully points out that "a client device selecting a service providing device based on attributes of multiple service providing devices" taught by Chang is **clearly different from** "a service providing device selecting a service profile from a set of service profiles for a client device based on the type information of the client device" taught by the instant application. This is because at least that: (1) **the former is directed to selecting a service providing device from multiple service providing devices, whereas the latter is directed to selecting a service profile from multiple service profiles**; and (2) **in the former, selection is performed by the client device, whereas in the latter, selection is performed by the service providing device.**

Examiner asserts that Chang "*wherein capabilities of a client device (information apparatus 100) such as type make and model (including operating system) are exchanged with a printer (output device 140) in order to send the appropriate drivers that are compatible with the client device to enable it to communicate with the printer.*"

Applicant acknowledges that Chang discloses exchanging type, make and model (including operating system) of the client device with multiple output devices in [0145]. However, **there is no suggestion in Change that the type, make and model of the client device is used to select an appropriate driver that is compatible with the client device to enable it to communicate with the printer.** More specifically, Chang describes uploading the driver in [0150]: "*After they (the output devices) have been identified, the necessary components or parts of components or data may be uploaded to the information apparatus 100 from output controller 120. Examples of possible components may include, without limitation, one or more of the following: data, device driver, printer driver, application software, software components, metafiles, user interface etc.*"

12

Consequently, Chang does not indicate that uploading a driver involves selecting an appropriate driver from a set of available drivers based on the type of the information apparatus 100. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully points out that in order to make the suggestion that the output device in Chang send an appropriate driver that is compatible with the client device, there needs to be a suggestion or indication that the output device possesses a set of drivers for different client devices. Unfortunately, there is nothing in Chang which suggests that each output device possesses a set of drivers for different client devices so that an appropriate driver can be selected based on the type of the information apparatus.

In summary, there is nothing within Atkinson and Chang, either separately or in concert, which suggests that **a service providing device (e.g., an output device) selects a service profile (e.g., a device driver) from multiple service profiles for a client device based on the type information of the client device**.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 to clarify that in the instant application, a service provider of a new service selects a service profile from a set of service profiles for a client requesting the new service based on the type information of the client. These amendments find support on page 9, lines 12-17 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Additionally, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 to replace some instants of the term "new service" to the more appropriate term "service provider." Note that in the original claims, "new service" is used to describe both the new service and the service provider. Hence, these amendments are made to distinguish between a service which is a function or a program requested by the client, and a service provider which is a device that provides the service to the client. These amendments are supported by the specification throughout. No new matter has been added. Note that these amendments have also been propagated to the corresponding dependent claims. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-3 and 5-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-13 and 15-20, which depend upon claim 11, claims 22-23 and 25-30, which depend upon claim 21, and claim 32, which depends upon claim 31, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   /Shun Yao/
      Shun Yao
      Registration No. 59,242

Date: 11 August 2008

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com

FC Amendment E.doc